



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/783,166	02/20/2004	Timothy A. Estes	31662-1001	7172
5179	7590	07/08/2005	EXAMINER	
PEACOCK MYERS, P.C.			VERBITSKY, GAIL KAPLAN	
P O BOX 26927			ART UNIT	
ALBUQUERQUE, NM 87125-6927			PAPER NUMBER	
			2859	

DATE MAILED: 07/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/783,166

Applicant(s)

ESTES ET AL.

Examiner

Gail Verbitsky

Art Unit

2859

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 April 2005.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 23-36 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☒ Claim(s) 23-36 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/29/2004
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Restriction/ Election

1. Applicant's election of Invention I, claims 1-22 in paper filed on April 26, 2005 with traverse is hereby acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that there is no burden on the Examiner since no additional search is required. This is not found persuasive because the Invention of Group II requires measuring resistance, determining duration, determining a number of failed samples, performing a thermal shock not required by Invention I and definitely requires an additional search.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claims 23-36 are withdrawn from further consideration as drawn to non-elected invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The term "precision" in claim 17 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite.

The term "precision" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-3, 5-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith et al. (U.S. 5942432) [hereinafter Smith] in view of Dunn et al. (U.S. 5324481) [hereinafter Dunn].

Smith discloses in Fig. 1 an apparatus (thermal cycler) comprising a (single) circular sample chamber/ carrier/ carousel; an opening/ manifold 109 in the center of the chamber for admission of heated/ cooled pressurized (compressed) fluid 105, a plurality of samples 101 in sample wells (mounts) for holding (receiving) samples, wherein varying temperature of the fluid influences (vary) the temperature of the samples. The sample mounts are evenly spaced. It is inherent, that such a positioning allows the samples to receive a uniform flow of air from the opening. The samples subsequently heated and cooled. The device comprises a heater and a cooler (col. 8, line 50) sequentially cycling the samples between at least two selected first and second temperatures (col. 1, lines 59-60), wherein the fluid is heated or cooled (col. 2, lines 62-63).

Smith does not explicitly teach that the samples are circularly arranged around the opening, as stated in claim 1, with the remaining limitations of claims 1-3, 5-14.

Dunn discloses in Figs. 7 a device comprising a carousel carrier (single sample chamber) 30 having receptacles (sample mounts/ slots) for holding samples. The device comprises a control panel, a microprocessor, a switchable power supply (network), a printer and a computer, a heating plate/ heating block 32, 26 wherein a warm air going from the heating plate 32 through the deflector ring 138 and hub 126 (opening/ hole) upward and outward (radially) the carousel to heat the sample circularly arranged around the opening (entire col. 7).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to modify the device disclosed by Smith, so as to have the samples circularly spaced around the opening, as taught by Dunn, so as to improve uniformity of heat/ cold distribution among the samples by allowing the equal distance between the samples and the source of the fluid, and thus, minimizing heat loss by traveling a longer distance to more peripheral samples.

With respect to claims 2, 3: having temperature lower or higher than an ambient temperature, as stated in claims 2 and 3 respectively, absent any criticality, is only considered to be the "preferred" or "optimum" temperature that a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been able to determine using routine experimentation based, among other things, on the type of the samples, etc. See In re Boesch, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

With respect to claims 7-9: cooling to a temperature lower than a desired low temperature, and heating to a desired low temperature and heating to a desired high temperature, as stated in claims 7-9, absent any criticality, is only considered to be the

Art Unit: 2859

“preferred” or “optimum” temperatures that a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been able to determine using routine experimentation based, among other things, on the type of the samples, etc. See In re Boesch, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

With respect to claims 5: the use of the particular kind of air, dried, as stated in claim 5, absent any criticality, is only considered to be the “optimum” cooling/ heating material/ / media/ fluid that a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made using routine experimentation would have found obvious to provide for the probe element disclosed by Smith since it has been held to be a matter of obvious design choice and within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use of the invention. In re Leshin, 125 USPQ 416.

6. Claims 1, 4, 10-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanners et al. (U.S. 6040691) [hereinafter Hanners].

Hanners discloses in Figs. 2-3 a device/ thermal testing apparatus to test one or more samples (electronic components), the device comprising a single chamber 24, an opening in the middle of the chamber for introduction cool air (fluid) through the slots 116 and removing heated air (fluid) through the slots 118 and a pump 32 (col. 8, lines 1-11). The IC 75 and power conversion are acting a heater (col. 7, lines 64-67). As shown in Fig. 3, the air is affecting samples (comprising daughterboards 75) 50 symmetrically (evenly spaced) positioned on mounts (electrical connectors/ slots) 52 around the opening. It is inherent, that the cooling/ heating vary the temperature of the samples. It

Art Unit: 2859

is also inherent, that such a positioning allows the samples to receive a uniform flow of cooled air from the slots 116. The device comprises a host computer 26 and data acquisition including memory and a bus 16 (switching network communicating with the computer 26).

7. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanners et al. (U.S. 6040691) [hereinafter Hanners].

Hanners discloses the device as stated above.

Hanners does not explicitly teach the air is dry, as stated in claim 5.

With respect to claims 5: the use of the particular kind of air, dried, as stated in claim 5, absent any criticality, is only considered to be the "optimum" cooling/ heating material/ / media/ fluid that a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made using routine experimentation would have found obvious to provide for the probe element disclosed by Hanners since it has been held to be a matter of obvious design choice and within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use of the invention. In re Leshin, 125 USPQ 416.

8. Claims 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanners in view of Birch et al. (U.S. 5701667) [hereinafter Birch].

Hanners discloses the device as stated above.

Hanners does not explicitly teach the limitations of claims 20-22.

Birch discloses in Figs. 1-7 a device for testing of about six test coupons (samples) 74 comprising nets comprising daisy-chain (col. 8, lines 56-57) of vias 112.

Art Unit: 2859

The device also comprises a data acquisition system. The device also comprises a heater (current) and fans 64 to cool the test coupon (cooling an air/ fluid around the test coupon) after heating by pulling air inside/ outside a cabinet (chamber) 44. The cooling/ blowing air can cool the test coupon to about (lower/ higher) an ambient temperature (col. 6, line 11). There is a switching network (controller) 60 multiplexing (switching) access of a microvoltmeter 52 so as to read a voltage drop across every coupon. The controller 60 also operates to control switching of the fans 64. The controller 60 is connected to a computer 26 and receives signals from the computer 26 via bus 42 (Fig. 4) also controlling the amount of heat (current) to the test coupons. Vias 115 serve as electrical conductive connectors for mounting the coupons to a board 127 (col. 9, line 67, col. 10, and line 1). Thus, sample mounts comprises electrical connectors.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device disclosed by Hammers, so as to use it for testing test coupons comprising daisy-chain of vias, as taught by Birch, because such a device also needs to be tested by heating and cooling, as already suggested by Birch, in order to provide the operator with accurately tested vias being able to correctly transmit right data.

9. Claims 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanners in view of Blumenau (U.S. 5506510).

Hanners discloses the device as stated above.

Hanners does not explicitly teach an ohmmeter with the remaining limitations of claims 17-19.

Blumenau discloses a device/ tester wherein, switching matrix connections (network) includes an ohmmeter to determine if there is a short circuit between connections.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device, disclosed by Hammers, so as to have an ohmmeter with a switching network, as taught by Blumenau, so as to test if there is a potential short circuit between connectors, and thus, to provide the operator with a correct testing data.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The prior art cited in the PTO-892 and not mentioned above disclose related devices and methods.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gail Verbitsky whose telephone number is 571/ 272-2253. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 to 4:00 ET.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Diego Gutierrez can be reached on 571/ 272-2245. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2859

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

GKV

Gail Verbitsky

Primary Patent Examiner, TC 2800



June 22, 2005